

**Hunters Point Shipyard  
Property Transfer Discussion  
Regulatory Agencies, Navy, City and Fivepoint**

**Thursday, June 10, 2021**

**10 am to 11 am**

*MSTeams details sent on calendar invite*

**1. Introductions**

Navy – Derek, Thomas, Beth, Heather, and Paul  
EPA – Yolanda, Wayne, Brianna and John  
City – Amy, Kashieca, Eric, Jim, Gordon and Christina  
DTSC – Nina

**2. Agenda Review**

Notes

**3. Dates for: next conference call July 15, next, next August ??**

Since the BCT meeting was moved to the morning of this day, let's switch to 1 pm on July 15.

Yolanda: EPA discussed the need for a monthly meeting. After July, we recommend to meet quarterly (October) until we have a parcel that is moving closer to the FOST process (as indicated with all appropriate remedial action completion reports drafted). Someone else like the idea. Thomas agreed.

**4. Parcel G field work & related and 5YR including Tech Memos**

**Fieldwork update** | Paul – Aptim has remobilized for Parcel G retesting soil fieldwork. Excavated trench unit 101. Weekly meetings with regulatory agencies oversight efforts continue.

Shared results on Strontium-90 with the regulatory agencies and are developing a memo on these results. The Navy had originally anticipated a Phase 1 fieldwork completion date of May 2022. Due to schedule delays, that fieldwork completion anticipation date has been bumped to August 2022.

Background - Parcel G Work Plan "if contamination is found" that would trigger 100% excavation on Phase 2. The Work Plan isn't prescriptive on how the sampling procedure would be done.

**Buildings**

**Derek** – We are close. Navy provided ACE new information on external factors.

**Wayne** – We are continuing to make good progress. There have been great discussions between EPA and Navy consultants and experts. EPA is unsure whether we are going to agree with the Navy's conclusions, and we are still evaluating the Navy's proposal. Wayne will know better on the 21<sup>st</sup> of this month.

**Amy** – asked some questions about internal (dust)

- **Wayne** – Our experts have developed some approaches to overcome some of the things we were stuck on before. We are unsure whether we come to the conclusions the RGs are protective. There is one new risk assessment concern, which we are discussing with our EPA risk assessor. We want to ensure the risk is being assessed in accordance with EPA

guidance. This discussion is happening at the regional level and have been consulting with headquarters (at the staff level).

- **Thomas** asked about a clarification on risk concerns – has this been discussed between ACE and RASO?
- **Wayne** – Wayne hasn't participated in the discussions the last week or so between RASO and EPA's Dave Hayes. Maybe Derek and Wayne can connect this week.

Amy asked about the "old" approach of building RGs (meaning the idea of scanning). Derek responded by saying that is off the table.

Wayne mentioned a lot of progress have been made over the past 6 weeks.

Thomas thanked EPA for all the time and energy into the buildings evaluation.

Background We appreciate the Navy took steps this past April to address the issues we raised in August 2020 about its draft evaluation for the radiological building cleanup levels. This action, plus a number of productive meetings that succeeded it, have been productive at moving this conversation forward.

- (If the Navy was so anxious to get this process moving, producing this April deliverable last fall would have moved this conversation forward much more quickly.)
- We continue to wait (for months) for the Navy to deliver a draft final work plan for D-1/UCs Parcel. This seems like a long time to wait for a document when the Navy is communicating how anxious it is to get this radiological retesting fieldwork moving.
- Finally, for the ongoing soil fieldwork - a mid-May remobilization date for the contractors doesn't seem to be in-line with the urgency the Navy is communicating, as it has been dry for a number of weeks.

There seems to be some internal housekeeping you all need to be focused on to keep your actions on par with these words of urgency.

### **Contracting**

**Amy** – wanted the Navy to talk about its "contracting issues." After 28 years of experience on this project, she feels this past year has been especially challenging. There have been a lot of delays and changing of deadlines that seem to have many impacts (Parcel F, rad stuff, Parcel D-1 Proposed Plan).

**Thomas** – mentioned this time of the year is always feverish with the contracting process, to get things tied up by the end of the fiscal year. This year, new rules have been established. Hopefully, everyone can appreciate the contracting rules that are part of the federal contracting process.

**Derek** – we are seeing some issues with the contracting mechanisms itself. There has also been some slowness, due to COVID. For example, Parcel F was awarded a contract to complete the ROD five years ago. The contract was "on hold" waiting for Yosemite Slough for two years. There is a "five year" rule on contracts that is creating a roadblock. However, for Parcel F, it appears it will work out soon. Long-time delays (?) are impacting the ability for contract work to move forward.

**Paul** – mentioned the new contract officer is really pushing the timeline of contracts. They are hesitant to award contracts over 12 months (WOW!) and don't want to extend contracts, especially

over five years. Parcel D-2/UC work plan contract was an issue with “bonding” and unique to the contractor.

**Gordon** – contracting delays can be caused by a number of things, such as regulatory review disputes. Is there a way some of these delays are addressable. Is there a better way to figure-out how to prioritize?

## **5. Updates on communications and meetings**

### **FOIAs/PIRs**

City has gotten four public information requests from Dr. Sumchai related to Parcel A. Some of these seem to be a repeat of requests.

EPA has two new FOIAs from Public Employees for Environmental Responsibility (PEER). One is focused on the submarine pens and one is focused on the “BPRG issue.” They are sticklers about FOIA deadlines and timelines.

Navy has a request from PEER related to the RDAs for the submarine pens and marine piers.

Navy has a new request (actually an old one that was misfiled) about backfill.

Navy appreciate EPA sending Navy some documents to review to be responsive. The Navy continues to review and will release, as appropriate.

## **6. Miscellaneous Items**

Notes

## **7. Action Items**